DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 889 CS 008 004

AUTHOR Fimiani, Guy T.
TITLE An Analysis of Vocabulary and Comprehension Subtests of Two Standardized Tests on the Ninth Grade Level.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 44p.; M.A. Thesis, Kean College of New Jersey.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis; Grade 9; Measures (Individuals); Readability; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Comprehension; *Reading Research; Secondary Education; *Standardized Tests; Test Reviews; *Vocabulary Skills
IDENTIFIERS California Achievement Tests; Minimum Basic Skills Test

ABSTRACT

To determine why ninth grade students taking the "Minimum Basic Skills Test" (MBST) and the "California Achievement Test" (CAT) performed differently in relation to reading achievement, a study investigated whether the noted discrepencies in reading achievement on the tests were due to differences in vocabulary and comprehension (skills and readability) inherent in both tests. Subjects, 180 high school freshmen, were given the two tests in the spring of 1984. Readability on the comprehension passages of both tests was determined using the Fry Readability Formula. The analysis of the grade level of vocabulary items on both tests was made using the Harris-Jacobson Core List. Both tests were also examined to determine the skills being assessed as measures of comprehension. In addition, a correlation of the results of the tests was made to determine the percent of variance accounted for and, finally, significant differences between the adjusted means of the test measures were made. The results supported three conclusions: (1) there were some similarities between readability and skills assessed on both tests, but marked differences also existed; (2) the difficulty level of the words in the vocabulary subtests was considerably higher on the CAT than on the MBST; and (3) the two tests measured reading of different kinds. (Extensive tables of data are appended.) (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED255889

An Analysis of Vocabulary and Comprehension Subtests of Two Standardized Tests on The Ninth Grade Level

By

Guy T. Fimiani

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Guy T. Fimiani

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements of the Master of Arts Degree

in Reading Specialization

Kean College of New Jersey

May, 1985

CS008004

With special thanks and appreciation to

My Father and Mother

and

Dr. Albert J. Mazurkiewicz

for their constant encouragement and patience

ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether noted discrepencies in Reading achievement on the Minimum Basic Skills Test and the California Achievement Test, were due to differences in vocabulary and comprehension (skills and readability), inherent in both tests. The population of this study consisted of 180 Freshmen students. It was found that little commonality exists between both tests, and that for the most part they are measuring reading of different kinds.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Acknowledgements	1
II.	Abstract	11
III.	List of Tables	1v
IV.	An Analysis of Vocabulary and Comprehension Subtests of Two Standardized Tests on The Ninth Grade Level	
	Introduction	1
	Statement of The Problem	3
	Hypothesis	3
	Significance of The Problem	3
	Assumptions and Limitations	4
	Sample and Materials Used	4
	Procedures	7
	Results	7
	Conclusions	12
V.	Related Literature	14
VI.	References	20
VII.	Appendices	23

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	FRY READABILITY RESULTS OF THE MINIMUM BASIC SKILLS TEST AND THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST	8
II.	GRADE LEVEL OF VOCABULARY ITEMS FOUND IN THE MINIMUM BASIC SKILLS TEST AND THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST	8
III.	SKILLS ASSESSED AS MEASURES OF VOCABULARY ON THE MINIMUM BASIC SKILLS TEST AND THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST	9
IV.	SKILLS ASSESSED AS MEASURES OF COMPREHENSION ON THE MINIMUM BASIC SKILLS TEST AND THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST	10
V.	THE MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND CORRELATION OF THE CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TEST AND THE MINIMUM BASIC SKILLS TEST ON VOCABULARY AND COMPREHENSION SUBTESTS.	11

INTRODUCTION

The main objective of the Education System throughout the United States, is to prepare our students for the roles they will play once they leave America's public schools. An essential factor for academic success in high school is reading achievement. Basic skills such as Vocabulary and Comprehension are necessary possessions for students on the 9th grade level. Unfortunately, there are many students who come into high school deficient in various subskills related to reading achievement.

If basic skills are necessary to attain employment, then it can be understood why the trend in American education is back to the basics. In order to get back to the basics, we as educators must be given help to locate the starting points to alleviate deficiencies. Devices like the standardized test provide the education field such assistance.

The purpose of standardized tests is to evaluate the academic skills of those students being tested. In the history of testing we note that it was started by G. Stanley Hall and his students at the end of the last century. "G. Stanley Hall and his students (1891) were the first to develop questionnaires, lists of questions designed to explore the content of the mind. These questionnaires were administered to many individuals of varying age levels in order to determine trends related to chronological age." (Gibson, 1971). E. L. Thorndike an early educational psychologist believed, "If a thing exists, it exists in some amount, and it it exists it can be measured." (Mort and Vincent, 1954). Both Thorndike and his students formalized the concepts and procedures for standardized testing. From the outbreak of the First World

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

War in Europe, up to the 1930's, testing went through various stages. It progressed from a subjective manner (oral and written examinations) finally, to standardized tests developed to measure schools skills and curriculum content areas.

The utilization of Standardized Tests provided two major advantages: 1. it's objectivity; and 2. it's ability to compare the results of different student test takers. These tests provide important information such as knowing what exactly has been learned and whether these results are significant.

Many of the incoming 9th grade students entering the Middlesex County Vocational and Technical High School (at Piscataway) possess some reading skill deficiencies. This school district has been stereotyped in the past by other district's throughout the county of Middlesex as a "dumping ground" for partially handicapped students. That view might have been valid at one point but, with increasing levels of unemployment of America's high school and college graduates, this view is rapidly changing. The vocational and technical student may very well include gifted and talented, and has always included students from the upper I.Q. ranges. Because this is so, "Vocational educators need to know the accepted approaches to the identification of the gifted and the strengths and weakness inherent in each: achievement tests, intelligence tests, measures of creativity and othe predictive instruments." (Colson, Milburn, and Burman, 1983). Certainly, then, vocational educators need to know much about specific test measures they utilize.

As there are advantages in Standardized Tests, so also are there apparent limitations. In norm-referenced tests (Minimum Basic Skills and California Achievement Test), students are compared to one another in their school population, as well as to other students throughout the state of New Jersey and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and the country. It's difficult to conceptualize how correctly a standardized test can reflect an individual's performance, especially when each test taker brings into the testing situation his/her own physical, intellectual, and cultural experiences.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There are many factors (environmental, cultural, economic, etc.) that can determine differences between both standardized tests (Minimum Basic Skills and California Achievement Test) in relation to reading. Such factors are difficult to control. Factors such as differences in the make-up of tests, however, maybe also responsible for differences in achievement.

THE HYPOTHESIS

The Hypothesis to be investigated is whether noted discrepencies in reading achievement on the Minimum Basic Skills and California Achievement Test (Standardized Tests) is due to differences in vocabulary and comprehension (skills and readability) inherent in both tests.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of studying this problem is to determine why 9th grade students taking the Minimum Basic Skills Test and the California Achievement Test perform differently in relation to reading achievement. Also, as a content teacher in the Middlesex County Vocational and Technical High School District (Piscataway School), it is important for me to see what were the apparent reading achievement deficiencies on the tests, and the possible reasons for these problems in my school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

This study is confined to the results of tests given to 9th grade level students of the Middlesex County Vocational and Technical High School District at the Piscataway School.

On the California Achievement Test, only the reading subtests of Vocabulary and Comprehension are given by the Middlesex County Vocational and Technical High School Guidance Department.

The State Education Department in Trenton, New Jersey uses only the Minimum Basic Skills Test - to determine overall reading difficiences amongst New Jersey Public School Students.

The scoring procedures differ on both Standardized Tests: A. Minimum Basic Skills (scores given in percent), and B. California Achievement Test (scores given in percentiles and grade levels).

SAMPLE AND MATERIALS USED

This study included 180 Freshmen students attending the Piscataway Vocational and Technical High School, during the 1983-1984 academic school year. These 180 students were given the following two standardized tests in the Springtime of 1984:

1. California Achievement Test (C.A.T.); and
2. Minimum Basic Skills Test (M.B.S.).

These tests provided assessment of the student's reading skills (eg. vocabulary and comprehension).

The California Achievement Test and their related predecessors have been available to American schools for about 45 years. These tests are "designed for measuring, evaluating, and analyzing (no longer diagnosing, as in earlier

editions) school achievement in terms of student performance in the basic curricular content areas of reading, mathematics, and language." California Achievement Test, 1977).

The standardization sample of the California Achievement Test was selected in a two method pattern. In included random sampling from public school districts enrolling more than 300 students and from Catholic schools. The public school population was arranged according to geographic region, average enrollment per grade, and community type. The Catholic school population was sampled according to enrollment, geographic region and type of school (diocesan or private). The sampling technique provided for representative proportions in the national norms of minority group students in the total school population. The final standardization sample contained 203,684 students from schools in 36 states. For all grade levels, scores are reported in raw scores, grade equivalents, scale scores, percentile ranks, and stanies.

The California Achievement Test is given to 9th (as well as 10th-12th grade students) in the Middlesex County Vocational and Technical school of Piscataway, during the month of March (this coincides closely with Minimum Basic Skills Testing in April). The school district uses "Book 17c" from the California Achievement Test.

A second reading achievement test utilized with the population is the New Jersey Minimum Basic Skills test. Statewide testing in New Jersey began in 1972 with the first administration of the Educational Assessment Program (E.A.P.)

The purpose of the E.A.P. tests was to measure student achievement in reading and mathematics based upon objectives taught in a majority of New Jersey public schools. The Minimum Basic Skills testing program was initiated in

September, 1976, when Governor Brendan T. Byrne signed into law Chapter 97 of the laws of 1976. That law amended Chapter 212 of the laws of 1975 (the "Thorough and Efficient Act"), and established uniform statewide minimum standards of pupil proficiency in basic communication and computation skills (Reading and Mathematics).

One of the main objectives of the Minimum Basic Skills testing program is to assess which skills in Reading (eg. Vocabulary and Comprehension) have been minimally met and mastered in grades 3,6,9, and 11 every spring. The Minimum Basic Skills testing program is usually given during the month of April of each academic year (this coincides very closely with the California Achievement Test period) to grades 9-12 in New Jersey High School's.

The Test Development committees of the Minimum Basic Skills Test were composed of reading and mathematics specialists, representatives from higher education and members of boards of education from across the state of New Jersey. The Minority Advisory Committee consisted of educators and non-educators, while the Technical Advisory Committee was composed of nationally recognized experts in statistics, and tests and measurement.

The item development process of the Minimum Basic Skills Test is identical each academic year. A testing firm is contracted by the New Jersey State Department of Education to develop the test items using the test objectives subitted by the Test Development Committees. The Test Development Committees and the Minority Advisory Committee review each test item to determine if there are any biased or invalid items on the subtests.

In 1978, the State Department of Education determined that the "cut off" for M.B.S. testing would be set at 65% correct in mathematics and 75% in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reading. Students who did not meet these proficiency standards are assigned to remedial classes in their high schools, to receive supplemental help to improve those identified deficiencies.

PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to determine why 9th grade students taking the Minimum Basic Skills Test and the California Achievement Test perform differently in relation to reading achievement (Vocabulary and Comprehension) as measured by these two tests.

The fundamental assumption from the start of this study was whether noted discrepencies in reading achievement were due to differences in vocabulary and comprehension, inherent in items, passages or skills utilized in both standardized tests. The first step of this analysis was to perform a readability on the comprehension passages of both standardized tests (California Achievement Test and Minimum Basic Skills Test) using The Fry readability formula. Secondly, an analysis of the grade level of vocabulary items used on both tests was made using the Harris-Jacobson Core List. Thirdly, an examination of both tests was made to determine the skills being assessed as measures of comprehension. Fourthly, a correlation of the results of the tests was made to determine the percent of variance accounted for and, finally, significant differences between the adjusted means of the two test measures was made.

RESULTS

As shown in Table one analysis of the Minimum Basic Skills Test and California

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table I

Fry Readability Formula Results of the

Minimum Basic Skills Test and the California Achievement Test

Test	Reading Grade Level Average
California Achievement Test	Mid 7th grade
Minimum Basic Skills Test	Low 8th grade

Achievement Test using the Fry Readability Formula, indicated that both tests have an average readability at the high seventh grade level.

The second phase of this study, dealt with an analysis of the grade level of vocabulary items used on both tests. As shown in Table two, the results were

Table II

Grade Level of Vocabulary Items Found in the

Minimum Basic Skills Test and the California Achievement Test

Grade Level	C.A.T.	M.B.S.
Above 6th	5	4
6th	15	4
5th	7	2
4th	3	8
3rd	0	2
2nd	0	6
1st	0	1
Totals:	30	27

(1) The California Achievement Test utilizes three more vocabulary items than the Minimum Basic Skills Test;

(2) The Minimum Basic Skills Test places a stronger emphasis on vocabulary used in grades 1-4; and

(3) The California Achievement Test places a stronger emphasis on vocabulary used in fifth grade and beyond.

The third phase of this study, dealt with an examination of what skills were being tested as measures of comprehension and vocabulary on both tests. Table III details the results of this analysis and indicates that in the category of vocabulary, both tests similary emphasized synonyms, antonyms, and

Table III

Skills Assessed As Measures of Vocabularly on the Minimum Basic Skills Test and the California Achievement Test

Items Types	M.B.S. Number of items	C.A.T. Number of items
1. Identifying Synonym of Word in Context	5	20
2. Identifying Rootwords	3	
3. Use of Contractions	2	
4. Identifying Verb Tense	3	
5. Identifying Plural Nouns	2	
6. Identifying Possessive Words	2	
7. Identifying Antonym of Word in Context	3	20
8. Identifying Homonym of Word in Context	3	
9. Identifying Word Meaning With Context Clue	3	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Word Meanings with Context Clues. In regards to the Minimum Basic Skills Test, the author placed an additional emphasis on other areas within the vocabulary domain (eg. root words, contractions, verb tense, plural nouns, possessive words, homonyms). Also, the California Achievement Test has 32 items in comparison to only 30 items on the Minimum Basic Skills Test.

In the area of comprehension reported in Table IV, both tests similarly emphasized the following: Factual Information, Main Ideas, Determining Meanings,

Table IV

Skills Assessed As Measures of Comprehension on the Minimum Basic Skills Test and the California Achievement Test

Items Types	M.B.S. Number of items	C.A.T. Number of items
1. Identifying Factual Information	9	25
2. Indentifying Main Idea Stated	4	11
3. Identifying Signal Word In Context	5	
4. Following Directions	7	
5. Identifying Major Topic	2	
6. Identifying Implied Main Idea	3	
7. Infer Cause and Effect	4	12
8. Draw Conclusion	7	8
9. Predict Outcome	2	
10. Determine Meaning of Phrases Used in Passage	3	18
11. Distinguish Fact/Opinion/Fiction	5	
12. Identifying Author's Purpose	3	
13. Distinguish Relevant/Irrelevant Information	3	8
14. Determine Validity of Author's Reason	3	
15. Relate Idea Not Discuss	3	

Cause and Effect, Drawing Conclusions, and Distinguishing Relevant/Irrelevant Information. It can be seen that the California Achievement Test utilizes a significantly larger number of items for each of the several types of questions. The California Achievement Test places a strong emphasis in identifying factual information and a strong emphasis on inference. Also, The Minimum Basic Skills Test had 64 items in comparison to only 41 items on the California Achievement Test.

The last major emphasis of this study was a correlation of the results achieved by a sample of students on both tests to determine the percent of variance or commonality measured by the tests. Results as shown in Table V were as follows:

Table V

The Mean, Standard Deviation, and Correlation of the California Achievement Test and the Minimum Basic Skills Test on Vocabulary and Comprehension Subtests

	M.	S.D.	r.
C.A.T. Vocabulary	21.9	5.45	.40
M.B.S. Word Recognition	25.27	3.125	

	M.	S.D.	r.
C.A.T. Comprehension	26.47	8.81	.25
M.B.S. Comprehension	49.83	10.[illegible]	

were as follows:

1. A 16% commonality in Vocabulary in the tests;
2. A 6% commonality in Comprehension in the test;
3. That even though The Mean and Standard Deviation, as was achieved by the students on both tests were similar in vocabulary, the opposite was found in regards to Comprehension; and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. The correlations are low to moderate and suggest little similarity in what the tests measure.

CONCLUSIONS

The main objective of this study was to see if reading achievement was affected by differences in Vocabulary and Comprehension, in both the Minimum Basic Skills Test and the California Achievement Test. After detailed analysis of the items, passages, and skills utilized in both standardized tests, the following conclusions to this study can be made:

1. That there were some similarities between readability and skills assessed on both tests, but marked differences also exist;

2. That the Vocabulary grade level emphasis is considerably higher on the California Achievement Test than the Minimum Basic Skills Test; and

3. That little commonality exists between the two tests as shown by the percentages of variance accounted for and therefore the two tests are for the most part measuring "reading" of different kinds.

The results of this study has shown that there are many factors that can determine differences in standardized tests, in relation to reading. Obviously, only a few factors have been examined here. Today, school districts throughout America are becoming increasingly concerned on how their students perform on standardized tests. The results of these tests can have important consequences on school districts (eq. Local, State, and Federal funding). But, overall, it is our responsibility as educators to use the information that these tests provide to locate and eliminate existing reading deficiencies in children.

RELATED LITERATURE

Standardized testing provides objective measurement of a behavior sample obtained under structured conditions. There are many advantages and limitations to this type of testing. Without this type of testing, Educators would have a more difficult time determining what reading skill abilities student's are deficient in. "The plain fact is that too many of our children cannot read and write enough to meet the basic needs of industry or the demands of citizenship. Yet we permit them to be graduated from our schools and even our colleges. The issue is not that our young actually are illiterate, most have a sufficient command of language to get by, to function on a basic level. What is missing is an active command of language the capacity to read critically, write effectively, speak convincingly, and most important, the capacity to use language to think." (Botstein, 1983)

The overall objective of testing is to assess certain skill abilities. "In order to make use of any testing device, a Teacher must be sure what the device is measuring." (Gibson, 1971) There are numbers of researchers who have found flaws in standardized testing. "Analysis of many tests purporting to measure I.Q. or reading achievement reveals that what is actually being measured is little more than skimming skill and eye-hand coordination." (Rudman, 1976)

Without a doubt there are many factors which may have an effect on the results of a standardized norm referenced test. They can include the following: (1) Reading skills going into a test; (2) The content of the test (vocabulary and concepts); (3) The level of complex syntax used in the test, and it's consideration of curriculum bias; (4) The background statistics of the test-norming population; and (5) The "Affective" domain of the student being tested.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Many leading researchers believe that learning may be affected by a student's background of experiences. "It is an undisputed fact that children with a rich background of experiences have fewer reading problems than those who lack them." (Kaluger and Kolson, 1978). Similarly; having equal importance is the acquisition of skills necessary to learn through reading. "The poor reader makes errors in word recognition, goes back often, does not utilize contextual clues, and does not get deep structure meaning. This laborious word by word reading is sometimes the result of inaccuracy and slowness in word recognition. His attention is still being focused on meaning." (Harris and Sipay, 1975) LaBerge (1975) found in his study of 16 college students that it took longer to respond to unfamiliar patterns. "The level of literacy needed to function effectively in today's society continues to climb as technology advances. Thus it is more important than ever that student's develop effective reading skills." (Micklos, 1980).

If I may reiterate, standardized tests have many assets. "Chidren's scores on reading tests reflect both their classroom reading skills and other skills that enable them to demonstrate this achievement during a test." (Stewart and Green, 1983). "It can identify students who need help in reaching minimum standards, and it can aid districts and states to spot schools, programs, curricula, and instruction that are not effective in meeting the needs of such students." (Gray, 1980).

Gibson (1971), stated that Alfred Binet observed learning in the classroom. He concluded that, to learn in school one needs the abilities to memorize, to comprehend the problems being discussed, to make reasonable judgements, and to solve different kinds of problems. To conceptualized what learning is we must direct our attention to Vocabulary and Comprehension.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Davis (1972) doing a survey on research comprehension found that vocabulary is a critical component of comprehension. Thus, "one may wonder whether a poor performance on a comprehension tests is the result of weak comprehension skills or inadequate vocabulary." (Wilson, 1972). Similarily, reading passage comprehension is closely related to the vocabulary contained in it. Samuels (1975), found that more and less fluent readers were parallel in their ability to recognize words, but that the fluent readers were faster in response. Jenkins (1978) found that studies done by Davis (1964, 1968), where he tested comprehension skills, five of which were significant, that one of those five was word meanings. The standardized tests of Stanford Achievement and Metropolitan Achievement Tests (1970) subtest vocabulary was mentioned because of it's relation to comprehension.

Vocabulary comprehension plays an important part in concept development. "Vocabulary is crucial because it is tied to the basic concepts in any content course, precisely what the students are trying to learn." (Dupuis and Synden, 1983). Obviously, if a student understands the vocabulary in a paragraph, comprehension and concept development may be enhanced. "Since the understanding of a reading passage is closely related to the vocabulary contained in it, an increase in vocabulary knowledge may result in increased comprehension." (Reed and Pepper, 1957).

Children's background experiences as mentioned earlier, may be quite significant in learning. Various levels of experiences, as they relate to concept development, can contribute to the performance level on a comprehension test. "Culturally different students are often discriminated against in a survey reading or achievement test. Since the test usually reflects the middle class lifestyle and experiences, the student's may receive a lower score on such

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a test than they would receive if the test reflected their own experience more effectively." (Miller, 1977). Jenkins and Pany (1978) found in comparing test items on a reading test that if words were more congruent with one curriculum than another, than children's performance on such test's could be affected.

The ways patterns of a sentence or syntax appear in reading material may also have an effect on comprehension. "The reader's interest level is important, as is familiarity with the subject matter. Textual arrangement and use of illustrations and headings can also influence readability." (McCormick and Pursel, 1980) Herber (1979) viewed 18 readability formulas and found that "only two concentrated on the grammatical complexity of the material." Bormuth, Manning, and Pearson (1970) found the following: (1) "That disabled readers generally exhibit a deficiency in utilizing the constraints of word order in sentences, and that this results in poorer comprehension in silent reading." and (2) "That some children do not develop sequentially the same syntact skills as normal children."

Another area where some attention should be focused could be the groups taking the test and the standardized population. Buros (1978) noted an interesting point about tests in this respect, he pointed out that the California Achievement Test places Jonesboro, Arkansas and New York City in the same urban category.

The last and probably the most important part of any type of testing is the effect that affective concerns (feelings, emotions, self concept, anxiety, etc.) might have on a test. "Anxiety is an internal anticipatory fear response generalized to many stimuli and which does not lead to a particular goal object.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This response has many accompanying physiological components, such as rapid heart rate, pulse beat, perspiration, and the like. It generally is regarded by the anxious individual as unpleasant". (Gibson, 1971) As anxiety might have an affect on testing situations, so also physiological concerns may play a dominant role too. "Readability can be affected by many variables. For example, Johnny might perform much better on a test during a period of time in which he is healthy than during a period of time in which he feels ill. Health is one variable affecting the reliability of a test score." (Gibson, 1971)

Another as important affective concern would be the self concept feeling of the student. "High self-esteem, the holding of oneself in high regard is highly related to success in school. The child who thinks that he is a lot of fun to be with, that he usually does the right thing, is proud of his homework, is confident and assured in his actions toward his teachers and his peers, is likely also to be the child who will learn most easily and be the greatest delight to his teachers. Conversely, the child who often wishes that he were someone else, gets upset easily, frequently is sorry for what he does, and most often is ashamed, is likely to be the child who, in the final analysis, has the most reason to do these things-he is the child who most probably will have difficulty and also pose difficulty for the teacher in school." (Gibson, 1971)

In general, standardized tests provide many advantages and disadvantages to both the educator and the test taker. "We have an obligation to be realistic with these students. To ignore the situation is to be hypocritical. As long as we administer standardized tests, we should teach students the skills for taking those tests." (Rudman, 1976)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Bormuth, J.R., etal. "Children's Comprehension of Between and Within Sentence Syntactic Structures," Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 349-359.

Botstein, Leon "The Future of Literacy Is In Your Schools," The Executive Educator, October 1983, 48.

Buros, Oscar K. The Eighth Mental Measurement Yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1979.

California Achievement Test, CTB/McGraw-Hill, Montery, California, 1977.

Colson, Sharon, Milburn, Betty, and Berman, Christopher. "The Gifted: A New Focus For Vocational Education," Industrial Education, October 1983, 10.

Davis, Frederick. "Psychometris Research on Comprehension in Reading," Reading Research Quarterly, (1971-1972), VII/4,628-678.

Dupuis, Mary M. and Snyder, Sandra L. "Develop Concepts Through Vocabulary: A Strategy for Reading Specialists To Use With Content Teachers," Journal of Reading, January, 1983, 297-305.

Gibson, Janice T. Educational Psychology (2nd Ed.). Meredith Corporation, New York, 1971, 16-129.

Gray, Dennis. "Guidelines on Minimum Competency Testing". The Education Digest, October, 1980 2-6.

Hall, G. Stanley. The Contents of Children's Minds on Entering School, Ped. Sem. 1891, I. 139-173.

Harris, Albert J. and Sipsay, Edward. How To Increase Reading Ability. Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1956.

Herber, Jean. "Syntactic Complexity: A Necessary Ingredient In Predicting Readability," Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1979, No. 8 13-19.

Jenkins, Joseph R. "Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension: Instructional Effects," Aug., 1978, ED. 160999.

Jenkins, Joseph, and Pany, Darlene. "Curriculum Bias in Reading Achievement Tests," Journal of Reading Behavior, 1978 X, No. 4, 345-57.

Kaluger, George, and Kolson, Charles. Reading and Learning Disabilities. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Co., 1978.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LaBerge, David. "Attention and The Measurement of Perceptual Learning," Memory and Cognition, (June, 1973), 268-276.

MacCormick, Kristina, and Pursel, Janet E. "A comparison of the Readability of the Academic American Encyclopedia, the Encyclopedia Britannica, and World Book," Journal of Reading, June, 1982, 322-325.

Miklos, John J. Jr. "The Facts Please, About Reading Achievement in American Schools," Journal of Reading, October, 1980, 41-45.

Miller, Wilma. The First R. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1977.

Rudman, Marsha K. "Standardized Test-Taking: Your Students Can Do Better," Learning, Vol. 4, February, 1976, 76-82.

Samuels, S. Jay. "Effects of Distinctive Feature Training on Paired Association Learning," Journal of Educational Psychology, 64, April, 1973, 164-170.

Stewart, Oran, and Green, Dan S. "Test Taking Skills for Standardized Tests of Reading," The Reading Teacher, March, 1983, 634-637.

Wilson, Robert. Diagnostic and Remedial Reading for Classroom and Clinic. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Co., 1972.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDICES

California Achievement Test

Students:	Vocabulary:	Comprehension	Total Reading
1.	26	22	48
2.	28	40	70
3.	22	31	53
4.	27	34	61
5.	26	34	60
6.	30	30	59
7.	30	33	62
8.	30	25	56
9.	20	18	38
10.	14	17	31
11.	15	11	26
12.	23	28	51
13.	22	33	56
14.	21	30	51
15.	7	14	21
16.	10	14	24
17.	17	25	42
18.	28	35	63
19.	22	26	48
20.	15	15	30
21.	17	27	43
22.	19	12	30
23.	28	40	40

Students:	Vocabulary:	Comprehension	Total Reading
24.	25	28	53
25.	22	11	33
26.	28	27	56
27.	24	32	56
28.	23	22	44
29.	20	30	49
30.	23	28	51
31.	25	16	42
32.	22	24	46
33.	20	30	50
34.	30	40	70
35.	15	20	35
36.	19	20	43
37.	11	12	23
38.	13	20	33
39.	13	13	26
40.	12	23	34
41.	16	20	36
42.	24	30	53
43.	24	28	52
44.	22	32	56
45.	28	34	62
46.	27	33	60
47.	9	9	18

Students:	Vocabulary:	Comprehension	Total Reading
48.	28	40	70
49.	22	26	48
50.	20	18	39
51.	17	19	36
52.	23	31	56
53.	14	6	20
54.	27	40	70
55.	23	24	47
56.	24	30	56
57.	27	28	56
58.	22	24	46
59.	24	27	51
60.	27	40	70
61.	27	40	70
62.	24	21	45
63.	21	25	46
64.	23	27	50
65.	22	21	43
66.	20	27	47
67.	28	34	62
68.	15	18	33
69.	22	21	43
70.	19	21	40
71.	16	13	29

Students:	Vocabulary:	Comprehension	Total Reading
72.	26	24	51
73.	27	33	60
74.	17	16	33
75.	23	31	56
76.	23	30	53
77.	26	40	70
78.	28	35	63
79.	20	14	34
80.	22	16	39
81.	15	27	42
82.	25	31	56
83.	14	19	33
84.	25	26	51
85.	27	30	57
86.	16	28	44
87.	24	11	35
88.	15	23	38
89.	20	23	43
90.	16	18	34
91.	26	40	63
92.	23	33	56
93.	27	34	61
94.	26	30	56
95.	26	20	46

Students:	Vocabulary:	Comprehension	Total Reading
96.	24	26	50
97.	25	22	47
98.	26	33	59
99.	20	22	42
100.	16	16	32
101.	15	12	27
102.	26	32	58
103.	27	31	58
104.	19	20	39
105.	19	19	38
106.	16	20	36
107.	19	24	43
108.	12	30	42
109.	16	17	33
110.	27	40	63
111.	27	33	60
112.	15	20	51
113.	20	25	45
114.	7	8	15
115.	20	26	46
116.	24	30	53
117.	20	23	43
118.	28	40	70
119.	15	18	33

Students:	Vocabulary:	Comprehension	Total Reading
120.	28	40	70
121.	27	30	56
122.	30	24	53
123.	22	30	51
124.	20	15	35
125.	23	35	58
126.	25	40	70
127.	24	34	58
128.	22	28	50
129.	30	35	70
130.	19	15	34
131.	25	31	56
132.	6	40	42
133.	20	30	49
134.	24	15	39
135.	21	30	51
136.	30	35	70
137.	26	21	47
138.	23	23	46
139.	24	30	56
140.	12	17	29
141.	3	5	8
142.	20	28	48
143.	8	8	16

Students:	Vocabulary:	Comprehension	Total Reading
144.	17	28	45
145.	26	23	49
146.	19	30	49
147.	24	40	61
148.	26	34	60
149.	24	21	45
150.	21	26	47
151.	30	40	70
152.	13	7	20
153.	21	17	38
154.	28	40	70
155.	20	17	37
156.	20	28	48
157.	15	24	39
158.	26	40	62
159.	21	11	32
160.	12	13	25
161.	13	9	11
162.	27	34	61
163.	21	31	52
164.	27	35	62
165.	17	26	43
166.	26	34	60
167.	28	31	59

Students:	Vocabulary:	Comprehension	Total Reading
168.	26	33	59
169.	24	40	63
170.	27	40	70
171.	18	19	37
172.	25	17	42
173.	27	32	59
174.	16	19	35
175.	21	35	56
176.	24	25	49
177.	26	26	52
178.	15	15	30
179.	25	32	57
180.	6	12	18

Minimum Basic Skills Test:

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
1.	27	45	72
2.	30	61	91
3.	30	57	87
4.	27	61	87
5.	27	62	89
6.	24	34	58
7.	22	57	79

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
8.	26	50	76
9.	25	53	78
10.	4	56	60
11.	20	24	44
12.	24	52	76
13.	28	60	88
14.	28	60	88
15.	17	21	38
16.	29	47	76
17.	25	52	77
18.	28	52	70
19.	29	58	87
20.	19	48	67
21.	26	40	66
22.	22	41	63
23.	29	58	87
24.	29	53	82
25.	22	34	56
26.	26	41	67
27.	26	55	81
28.	29	55	84
29.	24	51	75
30.	25	43	65
31.	28	43	71

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
32.	26	25	51
33.	28	57	85
34.	27	61	88
35.	25	55	80
36.	25	50	75
37.	26	26	52
38.	20	36	56
39.	23	44	67
40.	23	48	71
41.	23	44	67
42.	23	52	75
43.	28	57	85
44.	28	55	83
45.	27	55	82
46.	28	52	80
47.	18	29	47
48.	30	61	91
49.	23	56	79
50.	22	47	69
51.	21	34	55
52.	21	49	70
53.	26	59	85
54.	24	40	64
55.	27	58	85

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
56.	27	53	80
57.	28	48	76
58.	27	55	82
59.	28	54	82
60.	27	51	78
61.	27	61	68
62.	28	43	71
63.	25	56	81
64.	22	53	75
65.	28	46	74
66.	24	54	78
67.	27	62	89
68.	22	41	63
69.	26	53	79
70.	27	57	84
71.	22	23	45
72.	27	49	76
73.	23	55	78
74.	26	45	71
75.	26	48	74
76.	29	56	85
77.	29	62	91
78.	24	46	70
79.	28	45	73

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
80.	22	37	59
81.	23	45	68
82.	27	48	75
83.	24	40	64
84.	24	48	72
85.	26	55	81
86.	28	47	75
87.	24	56	80
88.	27	52	79
89.	24	51	75
90.	20	34	54
91.	28	56	84
92.	30	61	91
93.	25	56	81
94.	27	59	86
95.	21	36	57
96.	28	45	73
97.	29	58	87
98.	26	61	87
99.	24	50	74
100.	24	43	67
101.	26	38	64
102.	28	59	87
103.	27	58	85

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
104.	25	53	78
105.	29	51	80
106.	18	32	50
107.	26	46	72
108.	25	32	57
109.	27	50	77
110.	24	41	65
111.	22	44	66
112.	22	56	78
113.	21	38	59
114.	23	50	73
115.	16	42	58
116.	23	47	70
117.	22	53	75
118.	25	38	63
119.	23	60	83
120.	28	61	89
121.	26	38	64
122.	26	61	87
123.	28	49	77
124.	28	59	87
125.	28	48	76
126.	24	47	71
127.	25	58	83

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
128.	26	61	87
129.	23	57	80
130.	26	58	84
131.	28	60	88
132.	23	26	49
133.	27	52	79
134.	29	59	88
135.	29	56	85
136.	27	52	79
137.	21	50	71
138.	28	56	84
139.	26	57	83
140.	28	41	69
141.	29	52	81
142.	21	40	61
143.	11	24	35
144.	26	55	81
145.	10	10	20
146.	25	49	74
147.	29	57	86
148.	25	56	81
149.	28	59	87
150.	29	46	75
151.	26	55	81

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
152.	26	57	83
153.	23	53	76
154.	28	62	90
155.	16	31	47
156.	20	47	67
157.	30	59	89
158.	27	49	76
159.	30	53	83
160.	24	38	62
161.	29	56	85
162.	26	53	79
163.	21	23	44
164.	24	39	63
165.	25	57	82
166.	27	59	86
167.	29	58	87
168.	20	42	62
169.	24	59	83
170.	27	54	81
171.	29	60	89
172.	24	53	77
173.	30	47	77
174.	23	48	71
175.	22	38	60

Students	Word Recognition	Reading Comprehension	Total Reading
176.	29	60	89
177.	18	33	51
178.	23	59	82
179.	25	55	80
180.	21	51	72